# 29  Multiple Identities: The Roles of Female Parliamentarians in the EU Parliament

## RUTH WODAK

## 1  Introduction: Gender, Identity, and the Workplace

At the beginning of the twenty-first century, equal rights and equality of treatment are anchored in laws of equal opportunity in many Western countries (cf. Kargl, Wetschanow, Wodak, and Perle 1997). Attitudes, values, stereotypes, and role-images, however, are still severely encumbered by patriarchal traditions, and inequalities of treatment in professional and public life can be found everywhere (cf. Tannen 1995; Kendall and Tannen 1997; Kotthoff and Wodak 1997; de Francisco 1997; Martin-Rojo 2000; Gherardi 1995). Political life and the political world, in particular, are dominated by men (cf. Mazey 2000: 334). Despite the attempt to introduce the concept of "gender" into many areas of politics, including the EU (European Union), those who lead and dominate are still White men, and the agenda is still clearly determined by traditional values. For example, only one of twelve EU satellite committees, the EUMC (European Monitoring Center against Racism, Xenophobia and Anti-Semitism), is led by a woman. The legal norms on "gender anti-discrimination guidelines" are still at a developmental stage (cf. Eglström 2000), and experiences in the USA of "affirmative action" are clearly ambivalent in their value (cf. Appelt and Jarosch 2000).

  This unequal treatment of men and women in our society is manifest – apart from women's lower payment for the same work and their much-quoted additional burden – in language and linguistic behavior. For human beings develop language on the basis of reality: in other words, dependent on the particular social conditions in which they live. Language, therefore, reflects social structures in its own structure, and at the same time reacts on human

beings in the form of world-views and ideologies, thereby legitimizing the economic imbalance (Fairclough and Wodak 1997; Wodak 2001b, forthcoming). Social power is reinforced; the powerful everywhere are mostly elites, and these consist, for the most part, of White men. The same behavior is judged differently in men and women: we hear of "careerist women" but of "dynamic men." And in Women's Studies many stereotypes have also taken root, as in the "deficit hypothesis" (Lakoff 1975): this suggests that women lack something which men possess, and that where men are forceful, women are perceived as uncertain and hesitant. Dichotomizations did and still do partially dominate the academic debate (Wodak 2001c; Cameron 1997; Tannen 1997, 1989): men are accordingly seen as evil, dominant, and dedicated to competition, whereas women are good, subordinate, and cooperative (but see Sheldon 1997); in fact they come from "different cultures" (but see Cameron 1997). I believe that several levels are being combined here which – as the sample analyses below will demonstrate – interact with each other: the levels of self-definition, stereotypes, and the history of genders, the levels of power, hierarchy, and organization, and finally the level of observable real behavior.

Equal rights for women and men and equal treatment in professional and public contexts have long been sought by prominent women and women's organizations (Saurer, forthcoming). Yet when we look at this more precisely we have to say that women still have to justify their existence in the public domain, and often have to compete with conservative stereotypes, whereas men are spared this kind of legitimization pressure. They are simply, and more easily, accepted. In recent years, however, it has become clear that so-called feminine behavior is being revalued; trainers in organizational sociology are now attaching increasing value to cooperative and consumer-friendly behavior that is believed to increase both pleasure and efficiency in work. Some mixing of feminine and maternal stereotypes is taking place; powerful women are being forced into maternal roles and confronted with precisely these kinds of positive and negative transferences (Wodak 1996). The "mama" is undoubtedly powerful, but at the same time protective and understanding. Research among women leaders has shown that "gender" and organizational *habitus* (Bourdieu 1993, 1994) and rules overlap. Often an organization makes a greater impact in its norms and values than socially conditioned gender behavior (Diem-Wille 1996; Martin-Rojo 2000).

Unfortunately these almost banal truths have not always entered general awareness. In particular, consequences are so far rarely visible, such as similar career-paths for men and women, and similar degrees of acceptance in the various public domains (Diem-Wille 1996; Martin-Rojo 2000; Wodak 1997). In this connection gender cannot be separated from other identities: combinations of different identities and roles are always appearing, and so it is more sensible to look at holistic behavior and interactions than to try to identify the variables of gender in isolation.

This chapter is therefore concerned with "multiple identities" in elite women, in female members of the EU parliament (cf. Wodak et al. 1999; Wodak 2001a).

This public domain is particularly complex, and is determined by intercultural, ideological, ethnic, national, and gender conflicts (Muntigl, Weiss, and Wodak 2000). I ask how women can or do establish themselves in such a complex setting and what strategies they employ to present and promote themselves and to guarantee that they are taken seriously (Straehle 1998; Wodak 2001a).

First I will deal with the concept of fragmented and multiple identities; then a number of examples from authentic interviews with female EU parliamentarians will help to illustrate our claims and their resulting tendencies against the background of comprehensive statistical data. My principal hypothesis is that elite women must succeed in coming to terms with conflict-ridden role requirements and in developing their own individual images in order to be accepted in the political arena. For they will only have a chance of being taken seriously as exotic "flowers" or "birds of paradise" – not in competition with their male colleagues but outside of such competition. Then they will not be a threat but simply different, perhaps even admirable, but certainly acceptable. (The complete analysis may be found elsewhere; similarly, an explanation of the full methodology, and its location within the discourse-historical approach in the context of Critical Discourse Analysis, could not be undertaken here for reasons of space: cf. Muntigl, Weiss, and Wodak 2000; Wodak 2000a; Wodak and Meyer 2001; Reisigl and Wodak 2001.)

## 2 Sociopolitical Background: The European Parliament and the European Community

Since its beginnings in the 1950s, the shape of what is now known as the European Union (EU) has been constantly evolving. The original six members have grown to fifteen, the number of official languages to eleven, and the economic, legal, and political ties have expanded and deepened. With former Eastern Bloc countries preparing for membership in the coming decades, the EC's development and expansion will continue. At its core, this largely political and economic process also concerns identity constructions. No longer merely a geographical conglomeration of individual and, in the past, frequently belligerent nation-states, the web of ties connecting the member states of the EC seems to be evolving toward something beyond the sum of its parts. But what does this something look like? How is the European Union defined? Can we already speak of a European[1] identity or identities? What does it mean to be a member of the EU? How are national, organizational,[2] and individual identities invoked and oriented to in the discourses of EU organizations and those who represent them? And coming back to the main focus of this chapter, how are gender identities displayed and enacted in the midst of this complexity?

This chapter takes a sociolinguistic and discourse analytical critical perspective – one that shares the viewpoint that the EU, its organizations, and representatives are largely constructed (and construct themselves) discursively – in order

to investigate these sorts of question. This is done on the basis of interviews, conducted in Brussels during a period of intensive fieldwork, with delegates to the European Parliament (EP), civil servants in the European Commission, and representatives from COREPER (Committee of Permanent Representatives) and its working groups, the secretariat of the Council of Ministers. In this chapter, I will have to dispense with any comparison of EU organizations and will focus only on the EP. The analyses presented here form part of a larger multidisciplinary study[3] that examines the communicative processes shaping the discourses on unemployment that take place in the multinational, multilingual, and multicultural organizations of the EU in multiple genres (see Muntigl, Weiss, and Wodak 2000). More specifically, then, this chapter looks at expressions of identity in the context of interviews that focused (1) on unemployment in the EU in general, (2) on the preparation of and follow-up to a meeting in Luxembourg in November 1997, and (3) on the roles of what are viewed as the EU's primary organizational bodies – the European Parliament, European Commission, and Council of Ministers (including COREPER) – and individuals working within them.

   In this chapter, I will focus on the multiple identities of female MEPs and the construction of gender roles in such a complex domain as the multilingual, multi-ideological, and multinational setting of the EP.

# 3   Perspectives on Concepts of "Identity"

Sociolinguistic and discourse analytical studies of relevance to the analysis of identity in this chapter fall roughly into three groups: those using ethnomethodological/conversation analytic approaches to charting identity, such as Antaki and Widdicombe (1998), Widdicombe (1998), and Zimmerman (1998); studies conducted at the Department of Applied Linguistics in Vienna using a discourse-sociolinguistic/-historical approach, in particular Wodak et al. (1999); and those drawing on concepts such as footing, framing, and positioning, such as Goffman (1981), Tannen and Wallat (1993), and Davies and Harré (1990), or focusing on pronouns or person deictics, such as Wilson (1990) and Wortham (1996). My theoretical understanding of the notion of identity is most influenced by the first two groups of studies, and they are therefore highlighted in this short summary.

   According to the ethnomethodological/conversation analytic perspective, identity is not something static that people *are* or *have* (as is the case in much social science research where social categories assigned a priori are often seen as predictive of certain types of behavior), but as something that they can orient to and use as a resource in the course of interaction. As Widdicombe (1998: 191) puts it: "The important analytic question is not therefore whether someone can be described in a particular way, but to show that and how this identity is made relevant or ascribed to self or others." In other words, although

a person may be potentially classifiable by gender, ethnicity, class, or age, or as a doctor, mother, sister, and so on, these particular identities are not automatically relevant in every interaction she or he engages in. A person may invoke any number of aspects of identity depending on the contingencies of a particular conversation, or one may be positioned by one's interlocutors in a particular way (e.g. as someone in need of sympathy or help). The main point is that rather than using identities as "demographic facts, whose relevance to a stretch of interaction can simply be assumed" (Widdicombe 1998: 194–5), the analyst should "focus on whether, when and how identities are used . . . [C]oncern is with the occasioned relevance of identities here and now, and how they are consequential for this particular interaction and the local projects of speakers" (Widdicombe 1998: 195). To sum up, identities are locally occasioned, interactively constructed, and are resources "used in talk" (Antaki and Widdicombe 1998: 1).

With respect to the individuals interviewed for this study, it is important to note that while I have introduced them above as delegates to the European Parliament, civil servants in the European Commission, and representatives from COREPER and the working groups that serve the Council of Ministers, these labels represent exogenous identities, that is, identities that these individuals can be interpreted as "wearing" by virtue of their positions within particular institutions of the EU. In the light of the theoretical introduction here, it is important to stress that these classifications may or may not ultimately be relevant for these individuals in their discursive behavior in an interview situation, even if the interviewer has selected them specifically because of the expertise associated with their professional titles. Thus, for example, in one interview a Member of the European Parliament (MEP) may speak with any range of identities (or "voices" in the sense of Bakhtin 1981): as an MEP speaking as he/she might to a journalist, as one woman to another, as a Finn or Spaniard or Belgian, as a member of a particular committee or political group, and so on. Precisely which identity(ies) is (are) relevant at a given moment will depend on any number of factors obtaining for the particular discourse in which the interlocutors are engaged.

Zimmerman (1998: 90ff) makes a useful distinction between three types of identity found in talk: discourse (e.g. speaker, listener, narrator), situated (e.g. shopkeeper, customer), and transportable (e.g. African American, European, female). In this chapter, I am particularly interested in transportable identities, those that

> travel with individuals across situations and are potentially relevant in and for any situation and in and for any spate of interaction. They are latent identities that "tag along" with individuals as they move through their daily routines . . . they are identities that are usually visible, i.e. assignable or claimable on the basis of physical or culturally based insignia which furnish the intersubjective basis for categorization . . . it is important to distinguish between the registering of *visible* indicators of identity and *oriented-to* identity which pertains to the capacity in

which an individual should *act* in a particular situation. Thus, a participant may be *aware* of the fact that a co-interactant is classifiable as a young person or a male without orienting to those identities as being relevant to the instant interaction. (Zimmerman 1998: 90–1)

In a sense, then, I am interested in the degree to which these potential, transportable identities, for example Parliamentarian, Commission official, Greek, female, are actually *oriented to* in the interview data.

A word of caution is called for here: to some, labeling identities as "transportable" may seem incongruous with my claim that identities are not fixed and "out there" but are changeable and constructed in talk. Perhaps therefore it is useful to think of these potential transportable identities in terms of groups of characteristics, much like semantic fields. While a whole range of characteristics may make up our individual definitions of, say, "bird" (or in our case, Parliamentarian, Commission official, etc.), the context in which "bird" is used will ultimately determine whether what we are invoking is more like a hummingbird or an ostrich. In other words, if the transportable identity of "politician" or "female" or "Commissioner" is oriented to in conversation, even if we have, at some level, certain expectations (i.e. the characteristics constituting the semantic fields) of what "politician" or "female" or "Commissioner" mean, the specifics of any one of these identities are not predetermined and inevitable, but drawn in the contingencies of real-time talk. Moreover, I claim that gender – while constructed in the specific interaction in a specific way – is always out there. In contrast to Butler (1990), I believe that ultimately we are always perceived as women or men, in every interaction; this is validated by very banal facts such as the different payment of men and women for the same jobs. In such basic and fundamental social domains, human beings are reduced to their biological gender. On the other hand, I would like to emphasize that we all have a whole range of possibilities of enacting our gender roles, and that in many other situations gender is certainly not the basic issue. But as a result of long years of gender research and my own experience, I have come to see that gender classification seems – consciously or subconsciously – to direct the interaction and behavior of many people (see also Wodak in press) in very many contexts.

Among the transportable identities we could imagine as potentially relevant for the individuals interviewed is that of nationality, or even *supra*-nationality, a particular *European*-ness. In a recent study on Austrian national identity, Wodak et al. (1999) offer a discursively based definition of nation as well as a viable framework for its study. In this research, Wodak et al. draw on Benedict Anderson's (1988) characterization of nations as "imagined communities," noting that

> If a nation is an imagined community and at the same time a mental construct, an imaginary complex of ideas containing at least the defining elements of collective unity and equality, of boundaries and autonomy, then this image is real to the extent that one is convinced of it, one believes in it and identifies with it

emotionally. The question of how this imaginary community reaches the minds of those who are convinced of it is easy to answer: it is constructed and conveyed in discourse, predominantly in narratives of national culture. National identity is thus the product of discourse.   (1999: 44–5)

Based on the concept of "national identities," it is important to provide a working definition of "gender identities" and "multiple identities," which will be primarily drawn from premises of Pierre Bourdieu (1990), Paul Ricoeur (1992), Denis Martin (1995), Stuart Hall (1996a, 1996b), Michael Billig (1989), and the gender research of Peggy Watson (2000) and Jo Shaw (2000). Within the framework of Critical Discourse Analysis, in particular the discourse-historical approach, multiple identities are analyzed, while comparing discursive strategies of difference with strategies of sameness and describing a number of context-determined "narratives of gender and professional identities."

Though a very detailed account of the theoretical assumptions developed in our study (Wodak et al. 1999; Wodak 1997) would leave no space to examine the data which gave them their warrants (Toulmin 1964), it is nonetheless important to review three of these which are of particular relevance. The first is that we must understand Anderson's notion of "imagined community" (1988) as meaning that national identities are discursively produced and reproduced. Discourse, in turn, must be viewed as social practice.

Our second assumption draws on Pierre Bourdieu's notion of "habitus" (1993, 1994). National, gender, professional, or other identities have their own distinctive habitus which Bourdieu defines as a complex of common but diverse notions or schemata of perception, of related emotional dispositions and attitudes, as well as of diverse behavioral dispositions and conventions – practices, all of which are internalized through socialization. In our case the schemata in question refer to the idea of "*homo/femina europeus/a*," a European person, a common culture, history, present, and future, as well as to a type of "transnational corpus" or territory, but also to stereotypical notions of other nations, groups of "the others" and their culture, history, and so on. Second, in the specific context of gender identities and their construction, habitus refers to gender habitus (see Kotthoff and Wodak 1997). The emotional dispositions and attitudes refer to those manifested toward the specific "in-group" on the one hand and the respective "out-groups" on the other (be they different nations, genders, or political parties). Behavioral dispositions and practices include both dispositions toward solidarity with one's own group as well as the readiness to exclude the "others" from this constructed collective.

Thus, the discursive construction of gender/professional/national identities is always also a discursive construction of difference. Seyla Benhabib (1996: 3ff) states: "Since every search for identity includes differentiating oneself from what one is not, identity politics is always and necessarily a politics of the creation of difference. One is a Bosnian Serb to the degree to which one is not a Bosnian Moslem or a Croat." "What is shocking about these developments," she argues, "is not the inevitable dialectic of identity and difference that they display but rather the atavistic belief that identities can be maintained and secured

only by eliminating difference and otherness. The negotiation of identity/difference [. . .] is the political problem facing democracies on a global scale."

A further premise – and this is our third central assumption – is that there is essentially no such thing as one national/gender/professional identity, but rather that different identities are discursively constructed according to context, that is according to the audience to which they are addressed, the setting of the discursive act, the topic being discussed, and so on. I would like to emphasize here that identities constructed in this way are dynamic, vulnerable, fragmented, and ambivalent. We assume that there are certain systematic relations (of transfer and contradiction) between the models of identity offered by the political elite or the media (the system) and "everyday discourse" (life-world) (Habermas 1998). The fragmentations oppose existing dichotomies of the "private" and "public" which has been very well argued by McElhinny (1997).

I would like to turn now to the relationship between identity and discursive construction: if we regard gender identities purely as discursive constructs which are made up of specifically constructed narratives of identity, the question remains why somebody will reproduce a specific given discursive construction. Martin (1995: 13) offers a convincing answer:

> To put it in a nutshell, the identity narrative channels political emotions so that they can fuel efforts to modify a balance of power; it transforms the perceptions of the past and of the present; it changes the organization of human groups and creates new ones; it alters cultures by emphasizing certain traits and skewing their meanings and logic. The identity narrative brings forth a new interpretation of the world in order to modify it.

However, we assume that we are dealing not only with representations and discourses of gender/national/political/professional identities but also with social practices – how people enact their identities. This leads us back to Bourdieu's concept of habitus, which I elaborated earlier (see also Scollon 2000).

With regard to examining discursive data for instances of or orientations to national as well as gender identities, we have used the discourse-sociolinguistic/-historical approach which emphasizes three dimensions of analysis: contents, strategies, and means and forms of realization (see Reisigl and Wodak 2001 for the discourse model and argumentation strategies). Most importantly, I will be concerned with "narratives of identity" of female MEPs and their discursive strategies of establishing "sameness" and "difference" (in Paul Ricoeur's sense, 1992).

## 4   Survey Data

The European Union has decided to propose a strategy of "gender mainstreaming" (European Commission final report 96/67; see www.europa.int/comm/employment_social/equ_opp/gms_en.html) (cf. Pollack and Hafner-

Burton 2000; Commission of the European Communities reports, 1995, 1996; Council of Europe report 1998; Nelen 1997). "Gender mainstreaming" can be defined as follows: "Action to promote equality requires an ambitious approach and represents the recognition of male and female identities and the willingness to establish a balanced distribution of responsibilities between men and women." Moreover, the Commission report states

> The promotion of equality must not be confused with the simple objective of balancing statistics: it is a question of promoting long-lasting changes of parental roles, family structures, institutional practices, organizational work and time, their personal development and independence, but also of men and the whole society, in which it can encourage progress and establishment of democracy and pluralism.

Reading through all these proposals makes it obvious that we are dealing with very interesting suggestions, but the proposals stay on an abstract level (Braithwaite 2000). Employment policies are still to a considerable extent the responsibility of each member state (subsidiarity; Muntigl, Weiss, and Wodak 2000; Wagner 2000). Thus, the implementation of certain aspects is left to the member states, with their varying policies, traditions, and cultures (see Kargl, Wetschanow, and Wodak 1998). In the European organizations themselves, gender mainstreaming has led to higher participation of women, but not on the highest levels, as some recent statistics illustrate (see discussions in Rossilli 2000).

In the European commission, there are a total of 16,279 employees at all levels of hierarchy: 7,739 are women, 8,540 men. This means that women constitute 47.5 per cent of the sample. Looking more closely reveals that only 5.9 per cent are women at the highest level of the hierarchy (51 total: 3 women, 48 men). Such a distribution presents us with a picture that we know all too well: women advance only to a certain point in their careers. (Statistics from March 1, 2000.)

If we now look at the European Parliament (without having statistics available for the political parties), there is a total of 27 per cent of women from the total number of MEPs (169 women). Interestingly, they are distributed very differently along the fifteen member states: 34 from Germany and 27 from France are the highest numbers, but Finland and Luxembourg have the highest percentages according to their total number of MEPs (50 per cent). Sweden has 45 per cent, Denmark 44 per cent. These numbers illustrate the specific stance of the Scandinavian countries, which we find reproduced in the interview sequences below. Italy, Portugal, and Greece have the lowest number of female MEPs (11, 12, and 16 per cent respectively). (Statistics from July 28, 1999.) (See table 29.1.)

Although we would certainly need more data and more context information, these results already point to the large gap between North and South, to the different cultural traditions of the Mediterranean countries and the Scandinavian

**Table 29.1**  Women in the European Parliament

| | Belgium | Denmark | Germany | Greece | Spain | France | Ireland | Italy | Luxembourg | Netherlands | Austria | Portugal | Finland | Sweden | UK | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1994–1999[a] | 8 | 7 | 34 | 4 | 21 | 27 | 3 | 10 | 3 | 10 | 7 | 3 | 8 | 9 | 15 | 169 |
| Percentage of women | 32 | 44 | 34 | 16 | 33 | 31 | 20 | 11 | 50 | 32 | 33 | 12 | 50 | 45 | 17 | 27 |
| 1999–2004[b] | 7 | 6 | 36 | 4 | 22 | 35 | 5 | 10 | 0 | 11 | 8 | 5 | 7 | 9 | 21 | 186 |
| Percentage of women | 28 | 38 | 36 | 16 | 34 | 40 | 33 | 11 | 0 | 35 | 38 | 20 | 44 | 45 | 24 | 30 |
| Change in percentage of women | –13 | –14 | 6 | 0 | 5 | 30 | 67 | 0 | –100 | 10 | 14 | 67 | –13 | 0 | 40 | 10 |

a The numbers on Sweden, Austria, and Finland relate to the first European election (Sweden, 1995; Austria/Finland, 1996).
b Status: July 28, 1999.

countries where gender roles are defined in significantly different ways. The Southern countries are still very male-oriented (except for the famous role of the "mama"), whereas the Scandinavian countries have a long tradition in gender equality. Austria, Germany, The Netherlands, and Belgium are all situated in the middle range (around 30 per cent), whereas the UK and Ireland fall toward the bottom of the scale (17 and 20 per cent respectively).

Of course, these numbers tell us nothing about the quality of the attendance of these MEPs, of their initiatives and their positioning. In addition, we do not know if certain political parties (such as the Greens) favor women in contrast to more rightwing parties. And lastly, these numbers do not illustrate any success of the gender mainstreaming strategies mentioned above. Very different qualitative research, in the EU organizations and in the member states, is needed to provide some answers to the question of possible and promoted changes in gender structures.

## 4.1 The interviews

The data for this analysis consist of 28 interviews, with fourteen Members of the European Parliament, all members of the Committee on Employment and Social Affairs; ten Commission officials, among them eight from DGV (one of 24 directorates-general, DGV the administrative service responsible for employment policy), and one each from DGXV (financial institutions/company law) and the Commissioner in charge of employment and social issues; and four Austrian delegates to the Council of Ministers, one to COREPER II (ambassador-level, permanent representative), one to COREPER I (deputy level), one a bureaucrat of high standing in the employment directorate, and one a member of the Council's working group responsible for issues of employment and social affairs.

It is important to note that I make no claims of having representative samples of individuals from the EP, European Commission, and Council. All persons participating in the study were self-selected to the extent that they responded to our written and/or telephone requests for an interview. Moreover, of the MEPs who participated, ten were from three, largely left-oriented, political groups: the European Socialists, the European United Left, and the Greens. Only four MEPs came from what would be considered as representing more conservative groups (e.g. the European People's Party). In addition to the fact that we were able to interview only four individuals from the Council, all of those interviewed were Austrian and thus we can make no comparison with members from other countries. Finally, with regard to language, only those interviews conducted in English or German are analyzed here, these languages being either the first or second language of both the interviewers and most of the interviewees. All interviews were audio-recorded and later transcribed. In sum, then, we are working with a body of data that is suitable for in-depth qualitative, but not statistical, analysis.

The interviews focused on four general topic areas, which means that although certain topic-related questions were generally included in all interviews (e.g. "What do you feel are the reasons for the rise in unemployment in recent years?"), interviews were sufficiently loosely structured for interviewees to have considerable freedom in developing the topics and steering the conversation as they wished. The main topic groups in the interview protocol, each with several subcategories of possible questions, were:

1   unemployment, including reasons for and possible solutions to it, and perspectives on current employment-related policy-making, especially the Luxembourg Employment Summit of November 1997;
2   the role of the EU organization in which the interviewee works, including relationships with other EU bodies, the interviewee's own role within the organization, and his or her "access points," or contact with "ordinary" EU citizens;
3   day-to-day working life, including multicultural issues and the development of documents such as reports, opinions, etc.; and
4   the interviewee's personal history, such as career development, and definition of "being European." In this chapter, I focus on the construction of gender identities by women throughout the whole interview.

## 5   Methods of Analysis

Essentially, I am looking for when and how certain identities are constructed, achieved, and oriented to. In the data analyzed here, narratives (or personal examples and anecdotes that may or may not follow the "canonical" narrative form, i.e. consisting of abstract, orientation, complicating actions, evaluation, and coda as described by Labov 1972, Labov and Waletzky 1967) are particularly fruitful sites for the analysis of the discursive construction of multiple and gender identities in interaction. As noted by Schiffrin (e.g. 1996, 1997), Linde (1993), Mumby (1993), Ochs (1997), Benke and Wodak (2000, forthcoming), and others, narrative is among other things "a tool for instantiating social and personal identities" (Ochs 1997: 202). Schiffrin argues that

> narratives can provide . . . a *sociolinguistic self-portrait*: a linguistic lens through which to discover people's own views of themselves (as situated within both an ongoing interaction and a larger social structure) and their experiences. Since the situations that speakers create through narratives – the transformations of experience enabled by the story world – are also open to evaluation in the interactional world, these self-portraits can create an interactional arena in which the speaker's view of self and world can be reinforced or challenged.  (Schiffrin 1997: 42, emphasis in original)

What Schiffrin highlights in particular is the dynamic aspect of identity construction in interaction, especially in narratives. Most relevant for the analysis here, however, is simply that narratives can reveal "footings" in Goffman's sense that in turn reveal orientations to particular constructions of self. Moreover, the strategies of self-presentation and the topoi[4] used in defining one's own identities will be focused on in the analysis of some examples. The questions I seek to address as a result of the analyses are the following: what kinds of identities do the individuals in these interviews – whose exogenous positions potentially mark them as representatives of the European Union, of particular organizations within the EU's political structure, of particular units (e.g. committees, working groups) within those organizations, of particular nationalities or political persuasions – orient to and use in their talk? Do gendered or other identities come into play? Most importantly, though, I am interested in whether the MEPs, men and women, present themselves differently and in what way professional women characterize their experiences and their careers.

# 6   Some Results of the Analysis

In contrast to the European Commission officials, who tended to speak of themselves in terms of "we" referring to "the Commission" and equated this with the European Union or the European level, the MEPs oriented to numerous identities, both professional and personal. Among the professional identity types frequently oriented to are those such as (specific) EP political group member, EP committee member, rapporteur (elected to summarize a debate before motions are voted on), national party member, representative from a particular member state, and so on; very often, however, relatively more personal aspects of identity emerged as well, from that of social worker, family man or woman, grandmother, to more abstract presentations of personal or moral positions such as tolerant, or active, or diplomatic, or pragmatic. Many of these presentations of self manifest themselves in brief personal anecdotes or longer narratives.

As discussed previously, narratives are particularly revealing indices of identity because they offer a sort of "window" on to how individuals evaluate their past experience and position themselves in their world. Example (1) is a narrative in which MEP2 talks about her first experience as a rapporteur.

(1)[5]
1   when I – entered the parliament – *Orientation (lines 1–3)*
2   on my first report it was about Leonardo
3   I don't know if you know:
4   ((*smiles*)) well – I said "I'm going to speak to the commissioner"
5   and – I –/ I knew – he only speaks very bad French
6   and my eh my French was very bad as well.

  7   so I said "I want to have interpretation"
  8   So – I went to the commissioner        *Complicating Actions (lines 4–14)*
  9   with a very good int/ int/ interpreter
 10   and I/ I/ I/ I talked more than an hour with him.
 11   because we talked the same about it
 12   and at the end he said –
 13   "well: I have here the advice of my: civil servants but I – agree with you:
 14   and this and this and this all goes through. – "
 15   so you have to be: – eh: –
 16   I don't know h/ how do we call it in English in/ I
 17   in the Netherlands we say (brutaal)
 18   so you have to: ((*laughs*)) be polite        *Evaluation (lines 16–20)*
 19   but you have to – you:/ you mustn't be/
 20   you mustn't <u>sit</u> behind your –/ your <u>desk</u>. –
 21   because that doesn't help. ((*laughs*))
 22   but then/then then you have the worse system
 23   that I tried several times        *Coda (22–31)*
 24   then you have the Council. –
 25   a:nd – it's very difficult eh:
 26   to negotiate with the Council is my: –/ eh is my experience:
 27   it's possible to do: –
 28   bu:t – – now they have their own strategy:
 29   and their own – reasons:
 30   eh: and they don't like the power of the parliament
 31   so: the:/ the/ that's –/ that's the most difficult part.

In example (1), which has been marked for basic narrative structure according to Labov (1972) and Labov and Waletzky's (1967) model, we see that MEP2's story is objectively about having a successful meeting with a Commissioner while acting as rapporteur on a report about Leonardo.[6] In lines 4–14, the complicating actions, she shows how she went to the Commissioner with an interpreter, and because she and the Commissioner had the same understanding of the issues involved ("because we talked the same about it"), he was willing to support her, despite contrary advice by his "civil servants" on the matters involved. The main point of the story, or evaluation, from MEP2's perspective, is to show that as an MEP, to get things done, you must be active and assertive, "not sit behind your desk." While MEP2 might have felt hindered by her (and the Commissioner's) limited language skills in French, she found help through an interpreter and argued her points before the Commissioner – with success. Thus, in this narrative, MEP2 positions herself as an MEP who is proactive and who will do what it takes, including arguing directly with Commissioners, to see that her voice is heard. She also orients to being a rapporteur (line 2), which carries some responsibility in a committee, and to being from the Netherlands (line 17), although this last identity is evoked only to characterize her style of work (*brutaal* in Dutch, or "assertive").

    At the same time that she presents herself as a proactive MEP who has served as rapporteur on more than one occasion, she paints a picture of both

the Commission and the Council in a way that is consistent with what many other MEPs and EC officials in these data observe about the respective organizations. Here we see a benevolent Commissioner who is willing to listen to an individual MEP and to make decisions according to reason and his own conviction, even if that means occasionally going against the advice of his directorate-general or perhaps cabinet ("well, I have here the advice of my civil servants but I agree with you and this and this and this all goes through"). In the coda of the story we see that MEP2 compares the accessibility and cooperativeness of the Commissioner to the difficulty and uncooperativeness of the Council ("it's very difficult to negotiate with the Council . . . they have their own strategy and their own reasons"). Thus, MEP2's narrative also constructs a world in which the Parliament and Commission can work together as partners, whereas the Parliament and Council remain at odds. The gender identity constructed here, through an account of her activities and a description of her meeting with a powerful person, is that of a woman who knows what she wants and how to proceed ("*brutaal* but polite"). Women who tend to be successful have to be active, to fight for their opinions and not "sit behind their desk." Thus, a very active role is portrayed which might be in conflict with traditional gender roles, a role where women are viewed as dominant, threatening, and maybe even irritating if fighting for a cause.

In example (2), taken from the part of the interview with MEP10 that focused on the reasons for unemployment, we see how national and party identities may be oriented to as a context for understanding a particular interpretation of a political, economic, and social issue, in this case unemployment.

(2)
1  it/ it's quite <u>simple</u>. – why we have this – <u>high</u> – unemployment rate no
2  and it's because we are changing soti/ <u>society</u>
3  I mean we had a – highly in/ industrial society and now we are <u>changing</u>
4  so. – so: eh – this is completely <u>new</u> for us
5  and –/ and then we are <u>trying</u> – to <u>amend that</u>
6  and to try to – eh: help that up
7  with –/ with – kind of <u>old</u> –/ old <u>structures</u>: and – <u>old</u> – <u>answers</u>. –
8  eh: and – we don't want to <u>face</u> that we really <u>have</u> to –
9  adjust a <u>lot</u> of – <u>thinking</u>
10 I mean that/ that's –/ what it is <u>about</u>. – and –/ and –
11 we have to – <u>reconsider</u> –
12 eh what is <u>full</u> employment and what is
13 what is eh: –/ to have a eh/ eh – a <u>work</u> for <u>salary</u>: –
14 and a lot of that so/ sort of things. –
15 because I don't think that – we will <u>ever</u> –
16 ever <u>have</u> what called –
17 usually *in Sweden*/ fo/ <u>full employment</u> ((*laughs*))/
18 and –/ and –/ and <u>my</u> solution to that and/ and
19 *the* <u>*Green group*</u> is of course that
20 for the <u>first</u> you have to <u>see</u>: –
21 *we* have a/ had a –/ eh have another – eh eh another eh: – <u>approach</u>

22   and another – <u>view</u>: of – full employment. –
23   just to say that – <u>okay</u>. – this is – nineteen ninety. – <u>seven</u>
24   and h –/ we had so many f/ people in –/ unemployed.
25   so the <u>first</u> thing we should <u>do</u>: – is of course to <u>reduce</u>: – the <u>working time</u>. –
26   because – eh forty hours:
27   a week *as we are working in Sweden* now
28   it was not – eh institution of <u>god</u>. –
29   it/ it was – decided of with/ us ((*laughs*))/
30   the/ the time when we –/ when we <u>needed</u> a lot of people to <u>work</u>
31   so – re–/ reduction of working time of course
32   and <u>also</u> – to change the attitudes in society against
33   the people that <u>have</u> work and <u>don't</u> have work
34   . . .
35   <u>and</u> eh: –/ and <u>then</u> also of course we have to – <u>support</u> and/
36   and say that <u>flexibility</u> in that sense
37   you could work the hour that you <u>like</u>
38   and you could have a half-time <u>jo:b</u> and so on
39   and have a small company in size
40   so all these <u>taxations</u>
41   and all – the regulations
42   has to be: – sh –/ <u>changed</u>
43   and <u>altered also</u>. – to make this <u>possible</u>
44   eh: – and of course – the <u>taxation</u> or the/ the: –
45   you don't say taxation you say – eh: –
46   the tax on <u>labor</u> –/ on <u>labor</u>. –
47   <u>it's</u> it's quite <u>high</u>
48   I s:uppose it's – eh: – all the same in the European Union
49   but *in Sweden* – eh which I/ know most of course ((*laughs*))/
50   in the North West
51   there eh –/ there we have – <u>really high</u>
52   percentage of tax <u>on</u> – labor. –
53   and that should be <u>s:witched</u> and <u>changed</u>
54   of course so you put it on – *as I'm a Green* –
55   *eh MEP* – on energy:
56   and non resourceable –
57   eh: eh:m – ninedren/ non
58   <u>renewable resources</u> and energy and so on
59   so – <u>this</u>: should be <u>switched</u> of course

In example (2), MEP10 orients both her nationality (Swedish) and her political affiliation (Green). Although it is not clear why she points out her nationality in lines 17 and 27, in lines 19–26, where she has included herself as belonging to the Green group, she appears to use this identity as a resource (in the sense of Antaki and Widdicombe 1998) or context (Zimmerman 1998) for understanding the measures she advocates for addressing unemployment: reinterpreting the traditional understanding of "full employment" and reducing the standard number of hours worked per week. In line 49 she again orients to her national identity, even to a more local identity (northwest Sweden), as a type

of frame for her claims about high labor taxes. She is from northwest Sweden, where labor taxes are quite high, so she can speak as an authority on this issue. Finally, in this excerpt, she resumes her orientation to her political affiliation. She favors a switch in taxation from labor to energy and non-renewable resources, a position fully consistent with her identity as an MEP from the European Greens. Thus, in this example, we see how national and political identities can be invoked as a resource or context for understanding a particular perspective or presenting a frame of expertise. This female MEP defines herself mostly with the help of other identities (political, local, professional); the organizational identities seem to dominate gender issues (see Wodak 1997 for different types of female leaders and the overlap of gender roles and images with organizational pressures; see also Kendall and Tannen 1997; Alvesson and Billing 1997). She displays her expertise, primarily, and does not overtly reflect on her gender role. Of course, this interview displays only a single context; we do not know how this MEP perceives the organization on other occasions.

At this juncture, it is worth observing that among all the MEPs interviewed, it tended to be Swedes and Finns, as well as MEPs from either the European Greens or the United European Left (many of whose members are from Green parties in their home countries), who mentioned their nationality and/or party affiliation at several points throughout an interview. In other words, while almost all MEPs make reference to their party affiliation or nationality in the course of the interview (long before the "Do you consider yourself to be European" question), the Swedes and Finns, and/or Greens, appeared to draw on this resource more than others (see Wodak 2001b, forthcoming). The one EC official who invoked his national identity before being asked the "European" question also belonged to the Scandinavian group (a Finn). Although the analysis of more data (with more representative distribution of nationalities and political affiliations) would be necessary to confirm these tendencies, one might conjecture that Swedes and Finns, who have a long history of political association (e.g. in the Nordic Council and the European Free Trade Association, EFTA), and whose countries were two of the last three to join the EU in 1995, may tend to identify more strongly with each other as Scandinavians and less so as "Europeans" in the strictly EU sense.[7] One EC official (not a Scandinavian) illustrates this in an anecdote:

(3)
1 I was at a conference in Stockholm recently and I said
2 Someone was asking me, a Scanda/
3 It had to be a Scandinaviena because
4 And I said I lived in Brussels
5 And they said, "well you know, well are you Irish or something"
6 And I said, "well, I'm also a European"
7 And they looked at me and said
8 "that doesn't mean anything.
9 What does that mean?

10   I mean, you're a European commission official, that's why"
11   "I'm European you know, I live on the continent
12   and you all live –
13   not the continent as distinct from the British Isles
14   but I mean continent, the territory of Europe
15   and that for me has meaning
16   I mean it has influenced my history, thinking and economics
17   And will continue to do so"
18   I mean this girl was absolutely shocked
19   "you are the first person who ever said that to me", she said.
20   "I never never thought of it that way."
21   She said, "I know many people – "
22   It was, I know now
23   She was from Finland
24   And she said "I don't think anyone in Finland will think of themselves as European."
25   So that's very interesting.

This kind of observation is also relayed by the Scandinavians themselves. Almost all Swedes and Finns interviewed made comments to the effect of a "Scandinavian way of thinking" or noted the fact that (especially in Sweden) only a very slim majority of popular votes led to joining the EU, as in this excerpt:

(4)
  1   I know that *we* are a very stubborn country.
  2   Most of the people ah: are now: ah well.
  3   A ha./ mo/ most of the people –
  4   At least when was it fifty-one point four percent or something like that
  5   Voted in the referendum for entering the European Union
  6   But today *we* – almost never meet anyone who did –
  7   I don't know what they did
  8   Yeah because everybody said – do/ they said "no: I voted no:" and
  9   Ye said "well I really do I re – I really do regret" ((*laughs*))
 10   Aha:. – so it (happened) ((*laughs*)) okay:
 11   So I mean it's make/ it doesn't make the whole ah – /
 12   The whole billing – easier. (MEP3)

This anecdote reports a reluctance of many Swedes to associate themselves with the EU, which is not unlike the fact that it was largely Scandinavian MEPs (who were also Greens) who qualified their self-definitions of "being European" as *not* being restricted to just the EU. These examples illustrate our claims of the perception and construction of "multiple identities" on the one hand, and of the overriding of "gender" through national affiliation in the European context of the EP on the other hand.

  While I have focused on the evidence suggesting that Swedes and Finns may identify strongly as a group, a similar pattern is suggested for the Greens.

In the interview data, it is predominantly Greens who repeatedly identify their political affiliation in explicit terms (e.g. "I am a Green"; "I'm left"). Perhaps both "Scandinavians" and "Greens" see themselves as slightly on the periphery of mainstream EU politics and orient to this difference in talk to provide part of the frame for understanding particular points of view or interpretations of economic and social issues. Thus, these narratives evoke many strategies of "difference" and of the construction of distinctive groups. They also allow insight into the dynamics of this European organization, of the fragmentation that many MEPs experience, and of the loyalty conflicts between national, cultural, supranational, political, and gender identities.

Let us return, however, to the idea of the greater relative variety of identities oriented to by MEPs when compared to EC officials (see Wodak, forthcoming for details). The profession of an MEP, because of the enormous complexity of the domain, allows for individuality to be seen and heard. Moreover, it seems to allow for women to enact an active gender role, to succeed in being heard and listened to, and to succeed in implementing certain political goals.

MEP3, for example, oriented to a particularly wide range of identities (left, woman, Swedish, mother, political outsider, and so on) during her interview. Most striking is the way in which she repeatedly positions herself as being an "atypical MEP," thus using very distinct strategies of difference. Here we see one such occasion.

(5)
1   I figure here the most common – eh civil – job. – for an MEP
2   is eh to be a lawyer.
3   me myself *I'm far from that*
4   the job I had doesn't even <u>exist</u> outside *Scandinavia.*
5   so: – it's a sort of a social teacher – so
6   so I'm/ I'm very in/ an:/ a very special bird in this a:
7   IF mhm mhm so now you don't feel like you – fit into sort of a <u>typical</u> MEP eh
8   ME *no. no: no: I'm not. I'm left I'm a woman I'm Swedish* and I'm also
9   everything –/ everything's wrong. ((*laughs*))

In example (5), MEP3 contrasts herself with what she considers to be a typical profile for an MEP (lawyer by profession), emphasizing the degree to which she feels different ("I'm far from that . . . I'm a very special bird . . . everything's wrong"). She also points out many of the identities that she associates with, and that she perceives as marking her as different from the norm set by traditional, conservative, patriarchal Europeans (social teacher, left, female, Swedish). This sequence is a very good illustration of a successful woman who has managed to come to terms with all her differences, which have served to marginalize her, and to emphasize them. She "turns the tables," and strategically redefines the traditionally negative connotations into positive attributes. "She is a very special bird," and this way of self-presentation allows for her success. Conflicting ideological problems and dilemmas (Billig 1989) seem to be solved through self-irony, self-reflection, and assertiveness.

At other points in the same interview, MEP3 emphasizes that not only is she an atypical MEP, she is not a typical politician either. This is illustrated in example (6):

(6)
1   I mean I know that – even on/ on a: national level
2   I mean there are very many politicians all sorts in all parties –
3   that <u>prefer</u> to/ to meet the/ the – eh/ the citizens through – media.
4   eh –/ so *I know that I'm not that sort.*
5   so I prefer to meet the people. –
6   it/ it could be hard but it's more interesting. .
7   and that's the way <u>I</u> learn at the same time – a lot.
8   . . . and a (xx) of –/ I met so very many politicians – during my – living 45 years
9   ((*laughs*)) so: – and it's the –/
10   I mean do you really – when you've seen them in action
11   when you were a child or
12   all through the years – you say oh – how disgusting and –
13   what behavior they've done and instead I –/
14   *for sure I will not be that sort of person that I always despised!*
15   that means that if you go to a meeting
16   you just don't go there. –
17   and you just don't talk for forty-five minutes
18   telling everybody how the situation really is
19   and then you leave <u>off</u>. –
20   mostly with the plane first a limo and then a plane and
21   that's – not a boring life

Just before this excerpt begins, MEP3 and the interviewer have been talking about the kind of contacts MEPs have with their constituencies. In this context, MEP3 contrasts her own behavior with that of what she considers to be typical of (male) politicians. In lines 1–3 she casts the typical politician as preferring to meet with citizens indirectly, through the media. Alternatively, this typical politician "drops in" on his constituency only briefly, in a condescending, patronizing ("telling everybody how the situation really is"), and elitist ("then you leave off – mostly with the plane, first a limo and then a plane") manner. In lines 10–14 she elaborates on her point of view and emotional reaction to this sort of politician, emphasizing that her opinion of what is "typical" has been supported by observations over many years and that this to her is "disgusting." Thus, through irony, and overt criticism, she marks her difference from other (male) MEPs and constructs the negative out-group. All these strategies serve to construct her own identity. Moreover, in contrast to the other female MEPs presented above (both the active MEP as well as the expert), she does not align with a group, does not use an inclusive "we," and does not seem to belong to any one group. She constructs herself as belonging to numerous "deviant" groups (deviant from a normative perspective), thus emphasizing her uniqueness and her difference from others (much in line with "*idem*" and

"*ipse*" as described by Ricoeur 1992). In both lines 4 and 14, she explicitly dissociates herself from being "that sort of person." In other words, although by virtue of being an MEP she is technically a "politician," she is not of the sort one might imagine. What is implied is the "typical dominant male politician," who is not really interested in political content nor in the citizens and their needs, but mostly in persuasive rhetoric and sampling votes. Throughout the interview, she emphasizes her difference and uniqueness, according to our theory of the discursive construction of identity (Wodak et al. 1999).

This interview is one of five interviews with female MEPs which all use similar discursive strategies for constructing their gender and political identities. Of course one cannot generalize from such a small sample. I assume, however, that there may well be a more general tendency visible here which corresponds to my own experiences of working for thirty years in male academia and to numerous accounts in many studies throughout the professions (Saurer, forthcoming).

Although I have already suggested elsewhere that the types of identity oriented to by the EC officials dovetail nicely with the Commission's being described as carrying the "European conscience" (Cini 1996), that is, as promoting specifically European interests, I have still not made it entirely explicit why we might find the degree of variation in identities oriented to by female and male MEPs. In some ways, this multiplicity of orientations appears to be functional for the way in which the EP operates. Corbett et al. (1995, especially pp. 44–63) nicely describe the pressures under which MEPs work, and the directions in which they can be torn: although many EC officials undoubtedly also travel extensively, for the most part they are based in Brussels. MEPs deal with extreme time and location pressures tied to the EP's four-week cycle of activities (e.g. meetings and sessions in Brussels, one-week plenary sessions in Strasbourg, regular travel to the home country, visits to other countries as part of being members of inter-parliamentary delegations, etc.). At the same time, MEPs are involved with their political groups (both in the Parliament and possibly at home), sit on several committees, are called on to speak as experts at conferences and other public events, and act as hosts to visiting groups from their own or other countries. In short, there is no simple description for the "job" of being an MEP. Corbett et al. (1995: 63) suggest that in order to cope, an MEP must ultimately make choices and prioritize:

> the priorities of individual members are very different, as are their profiles within the European Parliament. Some become known as men or women of the House, and are constantly present in the plenary. Others are more effective within committee, or in their Group or their national party delegation, others concentrate more on their national or regional political image. Some members remain generalists, whereas others become specialists, and are always allocated reports or opinions within a particular policy area. Some even develop functional rather than policy specialities . . . Some only pay short visits to Brussels or Strasbourg, whereas others are always present, and have even bought accommodation there.

Depending on how individual MEPs organize their priorities, we may find very different kinds of identity relevant for MEPs across the board, and for an individual MEP. Thus the variability that we find in the interviews with MEPs as to the types of "we" and "I" identities they orient to seems to be functional, reflecting to a large extent the peculiarities of the European Parliament itself. However, I have emphasized the specific strategies used by female MEPs, which mark their uniqueness and their different attitudes to politics and ideologies in general.

   Basically, we have found three "types" or "habitus" of female gender role constructions, which seem to provide success in "doing politics": "assertive activist," "expert," and "positive difference (special bird)" (or combinations of these). These habitus and their related social practices are very different from other roles of successful women or female leaders as described in studies of female principals in schools (Wodak 1997) or in big businesses (Kendall and Tannen 1997). This first pilot study does not allow us to make strong generalizations; however, it is necessary to contrast the different types of organizations and professions with each other in order to explain these differences. Schools in the Austrian system in the above-mentioned study are extremely rigid organizations which allow for very little flexibility and are organized in a very hierarchical way; thus, possible gender constructions, moreover in a setting with children, evoke variations of mother roles and of carers (Wodak and Schulz 1986). In businesses, other dynamics are at stake, as described also by the general tendencies of marketization and consumerism. In such organizations, serving the client becomes more and more important; and many previously "female" attributes are regarded highly as promoting flexibility and endorsing a comfortable, thus more efficient, work environment (Fairclough 1992). The EP, as described above, through its complexity is much more open and less organized, and thus more flexible. This allows for a wider range of identity constructions: the self-definitions are not monitored as closely as in other organizations. More research into these organizational aspects will provide more detailed answers.

   In conclusion, therefore, a caveat is in order. The analyses presented here are not intended to be interpreted as *the* way that the European Parliament or female MEPs *are*. In addition to being inaccurate, such a conclusion vitiates the premise underlying this chapter namely that identities are dynamic in talk, and that potential, transportable identities may or may not be invoked in a given interaction. Instead, this chapter has set out to provide a plausible interpretation for some of the similarities and differences in *orientations to* and *uses of identities* by those women in the EP who participated in the interview component of our study, including their understandings of *European*-ness, if, indeed, they felt it could be defined. Moreover, I have used these interviews to respond to some of the questions we posed in the beginning: when can women succeed, when are they allowed to succeed? And how are multiple identities coped with? How are they enacted? It will be of interest in the future to see if women will have to remain "special birds," if women like to be special birds,

if women are made into special birds, or if there are other alternatives which women would like and which could arise. Or we could, perhaps, ask ourselves which special bird we would like to be . . .

## TRANSCRIPTION CONVENTIONS

| | |
|---|---|
| : | A colon indicates an extension of the sound it follows. Longer extensions are shown by more colons. |
| – | A dash stands for an abrupt cut-off. |
| <u>word</u> | Emphasized syllables, words, or phrases are underlined. |
| (xx) | Words in single parentheses were difficult to understand and could not be transcribed with complete certainty. |
| ((*smiles*)) | Double parentheses contain descriptions of non- and paralinguistic utterances by the speakers. |
| h | "h" without a period stands for audible exhalations. |

## NOTES

1   I use "Europe(an)" (unless noted otherwise) in the sense of "Europe consisting of the EU." As pointed out by several Members of the European Parliament (MEPs) who were interviewed for this chapter, what is geographically "Europe" extends considerably beyond the EU's current borders. Nevertheless, since the focus of this chapter is European identity-building in the European Union, I will use "Europe(an)" in the more restrictive sense.

2   In this chapter as in other work (e.g. Straehle et al. 1999; Weiss and Wodak 1999, 2000; Wodak and Weiss 2001; Muntigl, Weiss, and Wodak 2000) written at the Research Centre Discourse, Politics, Identity (see note 3 for description of Centre), a distinction is made between organization and institution that follows Rehberg (1994: 56). While "institution" is defined as the "social regulations" in which the principles, rules, and claims to validity (*Geltungsansprüche*) of a specific social order are expressed, organizations are the social formations that embody institutions. Thus, in this chapter I refer to the European Parliament, the Council of Ministers, and the European Commission as EU organizations rather than institutions.

3   The Discourses of Unemployment in Organizations of the European Union is one of the projects undertaken at the Research Centre Discourse, Politics, Identity at the University of Vienna (Austria) with the support of the Wittgenstein Prize for Elite Researchers (1996) awarded to Ruth Wodak. Research Centre projects build on numerous previous studies on organizational discourse and identity under the direction of Professor Wodak at the Department of Applied Linguistics at the University of Vienna. See

www.oeaw.ac.at/wittgenstein for more information on the Centre.

4   Within argumentation theory, "topoi" or "loci" can be described as parts of argumentation which belong to the obligatory, either explicit or inferable, premises. They are the content-related warrants or "conclusion rules" which connect the argument or arguments with the conclusion, the claim. As such, they justify the transition from the argument or arguments to the conclusion (Kienpointner 1992: 194).

5   Transcription conventions are given at the end of the chapter.

6   One of three EU youth- and education-related programs – Socrates, Leonardo, and Youth for Europe – established in 1995. Leonardo provides financial support for professional development and job training.

7   Individuals interviewed from Austria, the third of the most recent states to join the EU, did not seem to mention their nationality as often or in as explicit ways as the Swedes and Finns.

# REFERENCES

Alvesson, Mats and Billing, Yvonne (eds) 1997: *Understanding Gender and Organizations*. London: Sage.

Anderson, Benedict 1988: *Die Erfindung der Nation: Zur Karriere eines folgenreichen Konzepts*. Frankfurt am Main and New York: Campus. (Original English publication: Anderson, Benedict 1983: *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London: Polity.)

Antaki, Charles and Widdicombe, Sue (eds) 1998: *Identities in Talk*. London: Sage.

Appelt, Erna and Jarosch, Monika (eds) 2000: *Combating Racial Discrimination: Affirmative Action as a Model for Europe*. Oxford and New York: Berg.

Bakhtin, Mikhail 1981: *The Dialogic Imagination*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Benhabib, Seyla 1996: The democratic movement and the problem of difference. In Seyla Benhabib (ed.) *Democracy and Difference: Contesting the Boundaries of the Political*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, pp. 3–18.

Benke, Gertraud and Wodak, Ruth 2000: Stories about the past. Paper delivered at the IPRA Conference, Budapest, 2000.

Benke, Gertraud and Wodak, Ruth forthcoming: Memories of the Wehrmacht: The discursive construction of generational memories. In D. Nelson and M. Dedaic (eds) *War with Words*. The Hague: de Gruyter.

Billig, Michael 1989: *Ideological Dilemmas*. London: Sage.

Bourdieu, Pierre 1990: *Was heißt sprechen?* Vienna: Braumüller.

Bourdieu, Pierre 1993: *Soziologische Fragen*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.

Bourdieu, Pierre 1994: *Zur Soziologie der symbolischen Formen*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.

Braithwaite, Mary 2000: Mainstreaming Gender in the European Structural Funds. Paper prepared for the Mainstreaming Gender in European Public Policy Workshop, University of Wisconsin-Madison, October 14–15, 2000.

Butler, Judith 1990: *Gender Trouble*. New York: Routledge.

Cameron, Deborah 1997: Theoretical debates in feminist linguistics: Questions of sex and gender. In Ruth Wodak (ed.) *Gender and Discourse*. London: Sage, pp. 21–36.

Cini, Michelle 1996: *The European Commission: Leadership, Organisation and Culture in the EU Administration*. Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press.

Corbett, Richard, Jacobs, Francis, and Shackleton, Michael 1995: *The European Parliament*, 3rd edn. London: Cartermill.

Davies, Bronwyn and Harré, Rom 1990: Positioning: Conversation and the production of selves. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behavior* 20(1): 43–63.

De Francisco, Victoria 1997: Gender, power and practice: Or, putting your money (and your research) where your mouth is. In Ruth Wodak (ed.) *Gender and Discourse*. London: Sage, pp. 37–56.

Diem-Wille, Gertraud 1996: *Karrierefrauen und Karrieremänner*. Opladen: Westdeutscher.

Elgström, Sven 2000: Norm negotiations. The construction of new norms regarding gender and development in EU foreign aid policy. In Sonia Mazey (ed.) *Women, Power and Public Policy in Europe*. Special Issue, *Journal of European Public Policy* 7(3): 457–76.

Fairclough, Norman 1992: *Discourse and Social Change*. London: Polity.

Fairclough, Norman and Wodak, Ruth 1997: Critical discourse analysis. In Teun A. van Dijk (ed.) *Introduction to Discourse Analysis*, vol. 2. London: Sage, pp. 258–84.

Gherardi, Silvia 1995: *Gender, Symbolism and Organizational Cultures*. London: Sage.

Goffman, Erving 1981: *Forms of Talk*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Habermas, Jürgen 1998: *Die postnationale Konstellation. Politische Essays*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.

Hall, Stuart 1996a: The question of cultural identity. In Stuart Hall, D. Held, D. Hubert, and K. Thompson (eds) *Modernity: An Introduction to Modern Societies*. Cambridge, MA. and Oxford: Blackwell, pp. 595–643.

Hall, Stuart 1996b: Introduction: Who needs "identity"? In Stuart Hall and Paul du Gay (eds) *Questions of Cultural Identity*. London: Sage, pp. 1–17.

Kargl, Maria, Wetschanow, Karin, and Wodak, Ruth 1998: Sprache und Geschlecht. In Johanna Dohnal (ed.) *Eine andere Festschrift. Reihe Dokumentation,* Band 17. Vienna: Milena Verlag.

Kargl, Maria, Wetschanow, Karin, Wodak, Ruth, and Perle, Nela. 1997: *Kreatives Formulieren: Anleitungen zu geschlechtergerechtem Sprachgebrauch*. Vienna: Schriftenreihe des Bundesministeriums für Frauenangelegenheiten und Verbraucherschutz.

Kendall, Shari and Tannen, Deborah 1997: Gender and language in the workplace. In Ruth Wodak (ed.) *Gender and Discourse*. London: Sage, pp. 81–105.

Kienpointner, Manfred 1992: *Alltagslogik. Struktur und Funktion von Argumentationsmustern*. Stuttgart-Bad Cannstatt: Frommann-Holzboog.

Kotthoff, Helga and Wodak, Ruth (eds) 1997: *Communicating Gender in Context*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Labov, William 1972: *Language in the Inner City*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Labov, William and Waletzky, Joshua 1967: Narrative analysis: Oral versions of personal experience. In J. Helm (ed.) *Essays on the Verbal*

*and Visual Art*. Seattle: University of Washington Press, pp. 12–44.

Lakoff, Robin 1975: *Language and Woman's Place*. New York: Harper and Row.

Linde, Charlotte 1993: *Life Stories: The Creation of Coherence*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Martin, Denis-Constant 1995: The choices of identity. *Social Identities* 1(1): 5–20.

Martin-Rojo, Luisa 2000: Narratives at Work: When Women Take on the Role of Managers. Paper delivered at the Workshop on Theory and Interdisciplinarity in CDA, July 6–7, 2000, Department of Linguistics, University of Vienna.

Mazey, Sonia 2000: Introduction: Integrating gender-intellectual and "real world" mainstreaming. In Sonia Mazey (ed.) *Women, Power and Public Policy in Europe*. Special Issue, *Journal of European Public Policy* 7(3): 333–45.

McElhinny, Bonnie 1997: Ideologies of public and private language in sociolinguistics. In Ruth Wodak (ed.) *Gender and Discourse*. London: Sage, pp. 106–39.

Mumby, Denis (ed.) 1993: *Narrative and Social Control: Critical Perspectives*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Muntigl, Peter, Weiss, Gilbert, and Wodak, Ruth 2000: *European Union Discourses on Un/employment. An Interdisciplinary Approach to Employment Policy-making and Organizational Change*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Nelen, Sorah 1997: Three Challenges for the Future of the European Union's Gender Policy Examined: The Intergovernmental Conference, Kalanke, and Mainstreaming. PhD Thesis, College of Europe, Bruges.

Ochs, Elinor 1997: Narrative. In Teun A. van Dijk (ed.) *Introduction to Discourse Analysis*, vol. 1: *Discourse*

*as Structure and Process*. London: Sage, pp. 185–207.

Pollack, Mark and Hafner-Burton, E. 2000: Mainstreaming gender in the European Union. Unpublished MS.

Rehberg, Karl-Siegbert 1994: Institutionen als symbolische Ordnungen. Leitfragen und Grundkategorien zur Theorie und Analyse institutioneller Mechanismen. In G. Göhler (ed.) *Die Eigenart der Institutionen: Zum Profil politischer Institutionentheorie*. Baden-Baden: Nomos, pp. 47–84.

Reisigl, Martin and Wodak, Ruth 2001: Discourse and discrimination. In Martin Reisigl and Ruth Wodak (eds) *Rhetorics of Racism and Antisemitism*. London and New York: Routledge.

Ricoeur, Paul 1992: *Oneself as Another*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Rossilli, Mariagrazia (ed.) 2000: *Gender Policies in the European Union*. New York: Peter Lang.

Saurer, Edith forthcoming: *Liebe und Arbeit: Geschlechterbeziehungen in Europa* (*19. und 20. Jahrhundert*).

Schiffrin, Deborah 1996: Narrative as self-portrait: Sociolinguistic constructions of identity. *Language and Society* 25: 167–203.

Schiffrin, Deborah 1997: The transformation of experience, identity, and context. In Gregory Guy, C. Feagin, Deborah Schiffrin, and John Baugh (eds) *Towards a Social Science of Language: Papers in Honor of William Labov*, vol 2: *Social Interaction and Discourse Structures*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins, pp. 41–55.

Scollon, Ron 2000: *Mediated Discourse: The Nexus of Practice*. London: Routledge.

Shaw, Jo 2000: Importing gender: The challenge of feminism and the analysis of the EU legal order. In

Sonia Mazey (ed.) *Women, Power and Public Policy in Europe*. Special Issue, *Journal of European Public Policy* 7(3): 6–31.

Sheldon, Amy 1997: Talking power: Girls, gender enculturation and discourse. In Ruth Wodak (ed.) *Gender and Discourse*. London: Sage, pp. 225–44.

Straehle, Carolyn 1998: "We are not Americans and not Japanese, we are Europeans." Looking Inside the European Union. Unpublished MS, Academy of Sciences, Research Centre Discourse, Politics, Identity, Vienna.

Straehle, Carolyn, Weiss, Gilbert, Wodak, Ruth, Muntigl, Peter, and Sedlak, Maria 1999: Struggle as metaphor in EU discourses on unemployment. In Ruth Wodak and R. Iedema (eds) *Organizational Discourse*. Special Issue, *Discourse & Society*, 10(1): 67–99.

Tannen, Deborah 1989: *Talking Voices: Repetition, Dialogue, and Imagery in Conversational Discourse*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tannen, Deborah 1995: *Talking from 9 to 5*. New York: Random House.

Tannen, Deborah 1997: *The Argument Culture*. New York: Random House.

Tannen, Deborah and Wallat, Cynthia 1993: Interactive frames and knowledge schemas in interaction: Examples from a medical examination/interview. In Deborah Tannen (ed.) *Framing in Discourse*. New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 57–76.

Toulmin, Stephen 1964: *The Uses of Argument*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wagner, Ina 2000: Frauen in innovativen Betrieben. Project Proposal to the DFG, Vienna, Technical University.

Watson, Peggy 2000: Politics, policy and identity: EU eastern enlargement and East–West differences. In Sonia Mazey (ed.) *Women, Power and Public Policy in Europe*. Special Issue, *Journal of European Public Policy* 7(3): 369–85.

Weiss, Gilbert and Wodak, Ruth 1999: Organisation and Communication. On the Relevance of Niklas Luhman's Systems Theory for a Discourse-Hermeneutic Approach to Organizations. Working paper, Academy of Sciences, Research Centre Discourse, Politics, Identity, Vienna.

Weiss, Gilbert and Wodak, Ruth 2000: Debating Europe: Globalisation rhetoric and European Union employment policies. In I. Bellier and T. M. Wilson (eds) *An Anthropology of the European Union*. New York: Berg, pp. 75–92.

Widdicombe, Sue 1998: Identity as an analysts' and a participants' resource. In Charles Antaki and Sue Widdicombe (eds) *Identities in Talk*. London: Sage, pp. 191–206.

Wilson, John 1990: *Politically Speaking: The Pragmatic Analysis of Political Language*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Wodak, Ruth 1996: *Disorders of Discourse*. London: Longman.

Wodak, Ruth 1997: Introduction: Some important issues in the research of gender and discourse. In Ruth Wodak (ed.) *Gender and Discourse*. London: Sage, pp. 1–20.

Wodak, Ruth 2000a: Recontextualization and the transformation of meaning: A critical discourse analysis of decision making in EU meetings about employment policies. In S. Sarangi and M. Coulthard (eds) *Discourse and Social Life*. Harlow: Pearson Education, pp. 185–206.

Wodak, Ruth 2000b: "La sociolingüistica necesita una teoria social"? Nuevas perspectivas en el analisis critico del discurso. *Discurso y Sociedad* 2(3): 123–47.

Wodak, Ruth 2001a: What CDA is about – a summary of its history, important concepts and its developments. In Ruth Wodak and Michael Meyer (eds) *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*. London: Sage, pp. 1–14.

Wodak, Ruth 2001b: Politikwissenschaft und Diskursanalyse: Diskurs in/der Politik. In Andrei S. Markovits and Sieglinde K. Rosenberger (eds) *Demokratie. Modus und Telos*. Beiträge für Anton Pelinka. Vienna: Böhlau, pp. 75–99.

Wodak, Ruth 2001c: Diskurs, Politik, Identität. In Oswald Panagl, Hans Goebl, and Emil Brix (eds) *Der Mensch und seine Sprache(n)*. Vienna: Böhlau, pp. 133–55.

Wodak, Ruth in press: Gender and language (cultural concern essay). In *International Encyclopedia of the Social and Behavioral Sciences*. Oxford: Elsevier Science.

Wodak, Ruth forthcoming: Multinational organisations: Europe in the search of new identities. *Conference Proceedings*. City University of Hong Kong Press.

Wodak, Ruth, de Cillia, Rudolf, Reisigl, Martin, and Liebhart, Karin 1999: *The Discursive Construction of National Identity*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Wodak, Ruth and Meyer, Michael (eds) 2001: *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*. London: Sage.

Wodak, Ruth and Schulz, Muriel 1986: *The Language of Love and Guilt: Mother–Daughter Relationships from a Cross-cultural Perspective*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Wodak, Ruth and Weiss, Gilbert 2001: "We are different than the Americans and the Japanese?" A critical discourse analysis of decision-making in European Union meetings about employment policies. In Edda Weigand and Marcelo Dascal (eds) *Negotiation and Power in Dialogic Interaction*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Wortham, Stanton 1996: Mapping participant deictics: A technique for discovering speakers' footing. *Journal of Pragmatics* 25: 331–48.

Zimmerman, Don H. 1998: Identity, context and interaction. In Charles Antaki and Sue Widdicombe (eds) *Identities in Talk*. London: Sage, pp. 87–106.